



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,367	10/11/2001	Robert F. Kwasnick	INTL-0656-US (P10836)	9531

7590 08/13/2003

Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
STE 100
8554 KATY FWY
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER

GUHARAY, KARABI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/975,367

Applicant(s)

KWASNICK ET AL.

Examiner

Karabi Guharay

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment A, filed 29 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-13,15-25 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-13,15-25 and 27-30 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 October 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2879

Amendment A, filed on 29 May, 2003 has been considered and entered.

Amendment of title is acknowledged.

Claims 4, 14, and 26 are cancelled.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "18" has been used to designate both rear side of optical plate 16 and front section of module 15. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-25, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greene et al. (US 5903328), in view of Greene et al (US 5661531).

Regarding claims 1 & 11, Greene et al. in # 5903328, disclose an array display comprising (Fig 1B, Fig 2) comprising plurality of panels (tiles A, B, C, D) abutted together in side by side arrangement to form an array and defining seams (E, F of Fig 1, and also see Fig 2) between adjacent panels and a resilient material (adhesive 16, 19, lines 27-29 of column 3) around the tiles the resilient material (16, 19) of adjacent

Art Unit: 2879

panels abutting to form the seam (lines 13-16 of column 5). But Greene et al. in patent # 5903328 does not specifically disclose that the resilient material (16, 19) are black, however teaches in patent # 5661531 that the gap between tiles (inter tile gap 160) which defines seam (see Fig 14) is covered by light shield layer 161 so as to suppress secondary rays emanating from the gaps between tiles in order to have invisible seams (see lines 1-12 of column 3, and lines 62-63 of column 8, lines 20-21 of column 11).

Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use black resilient material in the device of patent # 5903328 in order to suppress secondary rays thus produce invisible seam.

Regarding claims 2, 12-13, Greene et al. meet the limitations except for the limitation of resilient material 16 is foam. However, Greene et al. teaches low elastic modulus material as the adhesive material 16. It is well known in the art that foam is a low elastic modulus material.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use foam such as silicone rubber since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use.

Regarding claim 3, Green et al. disclose that the resilient material epoxy seal 19 is polymer (line 52 of column 3).

Regarding claims 5-6 & 15-17, Greene et al. disclose that the display includes optical integrator (cover plate 14, and back plate 200 of Fig 3 and Fig 1B) positioned over the panels (tiles), a filler material (36) with matching optical characteristics with the

Art Unit: 2879

optical integrator (glass cover 14 and back plate 200) positioned between the optical integrators.

Regarding claims 7-9, & 18-20, Greene et al, in patent # 5661531 showed black matrix lines (57 of Fig 13), in the optical integrator (58) plate and further showed upper portion of the adhesive layer 163 is substantially match the optical characteristics of the black lines (here seams between the tiles are filled with light shielding layer as in black mask 57), in order to create invisible seam (lines 40 of column 10- line 23 of column 11). Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to introduce black lines in the optical integrator and upper portion of the adhesive in the seam matching optical characteristics of black lines so that seams become invisible.

Regarding claim 10, Greene et al. in patent, # 5903328, an upper portion of the resilient material (16) which is epoxy seal 19, different from the resilient material (16).

Regarding claim 21, Greene et al. disclose all the limitations of claim 5 (see rejection of claim 5) except for the panels being OLEDs forming an array display.

However, array displays having plurality of panels can be made by LCDs or OLEDs or PDPs. It is noted that applicant's specific OLED does not solve any of the stated problems or yield any unexpected result that is not within the scope of the teachings applied. Therefore it is considered to be a matter of choice, which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious to select one of the display devices such as LCD, PDP or OLED to form an array display.

Art Unit: 2879

Claims 22-23 recite essentially the same limitations of claims 5-6 respectively.

Thus claims 22-23 are rejected as claims 5-6 (see rejection of claims 5-6).

Claim 24 recites essentially the same limitations of claim 2, thus claim 24 is rejected as claim 2 (see rejection of claim 2).

Claim 25 recites essentially the same limitations of claim 3, thus claim 25 is rejected as claim 3 (see rejection of claim 3).

Claim 27 recites essentially the same limitations of claim 7, thus claim 27 is rejected as claim 7 (see rejection of claim 7).

Claims 28-29 recite essentially the same limitations of claims 8-10 respectively. Thus claims 28-29 are rejected as claims 8-9 (see rejections of claims 8-9).

Claim 30 recites essentially the same limitations of claim 10. Thus claim 30 is rejected as claim 10 (see rejection of claim 10).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 29 May 2003, regarding drawing objection have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In this case, in specification, page 4, "18" is designated as the rear side of the optical integrator plate 16. However, the top portion or front section of module 15 is also designated in Fig 2 by # 18. Front section of module 15 may be adjacent to the rear side of the optical integrator plate 16 but definitely these two elements are different, thus can not be named by same number.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2879

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karabi Guharay whose telephone number is (703) 305-1971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 308-7382.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

K.G.

Karabi Guharay
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879



NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800